



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Of vital significance for understanding the rise of the kingship is the distinction between private and public magic. The public magician, the rain-maker for instance, is supposed to perform a service for the whole community. Accordingly the ablest men are called into the service of public magic. Moreover, in self-protection, they are stimulated to acquire real knowledge of nature's laws in order to diminish the danger of failures. True science is thus developed from pseudo-science. In turn this special knowledge becomes the basis of magisterial power. The monarch arises. "On the whole, then, we seem to be justified in concluding that in many parts of the world the king is the lineal successor of the old magician or medicine-man" (p. 127). The special class of sorcerers, entrusted with functions upon which the public welfare and safety depend, tend to "blossom out into sacred kings". In a further stage of evolution the magician yields to the priest; and the human king becomes an incarnate god.

In the concluding five chapters of his book Dr. Frazer has with extraordinary insight minutely applied the principles thus won by his investigation to the interpretation of the rites and myths connected with Diana at Nemi and her priest-king, the *Rex Nemorensis*. There is not space here even for a summary of his argument. He has made a notable contribution to the literature of primitive sociology; and the further development of the subject, promised in the forthcoming edition of the *Golden Bough*, will be eagerly awaited.

GEORGE ELLIOTT HOWARD.

A History of Egypt from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest. By JAMES HENRY BREASTED. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1905. Pp. xxx, 634, with 200 illustrations and maps.)

THIS book fills a great want. Hitherto there has been no history of Egypt in the English language at once sufficiently reliable, full, and popular. The best English work, W. M. F. Petrie's valuable *History of Egypt*, has the great disadvantage of being written entirely for Egyptologists. Breasted has followed chiefly the plan of Eduard Meyer's very readable sketch (*Geschichte Aegyptens*, now antiquated); expanding it somewhat after the model of Maspero's larger work. His book is lucidly and elegantly written, and I have heard that it reads like a novel, to the non-orientalist. The illustrations, among which there are some good, new photographs, contribute considerably to the attractive nature of the book, which doubtless will meet with great success.

The specialist will find many recent discoveries and researches incorporated in the volume and several original observations, for example, the account of the rise of the twelfth dynasty (pp. 154-155). Some general sketches of the culture of various periods are meritorious, for example, that on the earliest period (chapter 3), chapters 13, 18, etc.

The book is not addressed to the student of historical science who is himself no Egyptologist. It lacks the apparatus of references which the scientific worker cannot do without. There are, indeed, some footnotes, but with rare exceptions the author refers only to his own publications (among which, it is true, there is a very comprehensive collection of translations). Furthermore he does not emphasize the many uncertainties and problems of Egyptian history as the historian would like. A popular work, of course, must smooth over such difficulties. The writer has done this very largely and has filled out gaps, often with some poetic license. Thus he claims, for example, that the famous queen Hatshepsout was "beautiful and gifted" (p. 267); but the dry historian must insist that we have neither the mummy nor a reliable picture to prove her supposed beauty, nor a line of writing which would exclude the possibility that she may have been a very ordinary person or even an idiotic cipher, serving as a legitimizing pretext for the ambitions of her ruling officials. (This latter possibility might even seem much more plausible, especially, if Breasted's partly hypothetical construction of her reign (chap. 15) should prove to be correct.) Other instances of poetic license might lead to more serious misunderstandings, for example, the hypothetical "free middle class, liable to military service" (p. 246). Not everybody would agree with the amount of faith given to Greek historians (Herodotus, p. 37), especially to Manetho (e. g., p. 148).

It is not possible to notice here rather numerous points of disagreement in regard to detail. I would only criticize some general principles. The writer seems to me to view Egypt too often not as a critic but as an over-enthusiastic lover and admirer, a fault rather general with the older school of Egyptologists. In face of the one-sidedness of historians who knew only Greece and Rome, orientalists found it necessary to paint the Orient and its importance sometimes with very thick coloring. Nowadays it seems no longer necessary to do this; we may even show numerous defects without fear of reviving the old injustice. For example, the most remarkable bequest of ancient Egypt is, doubtless, its art, which was long underestimated. But to ascribe even chiaroscuro (p. 378) to painters who never advanced to recognizing light and shadow seems a strong overstatement. The poetic enthusiasm of our writer manifests itself in a quite unbalanced overrating of the small military achievements of the Egyptians, one of the least military nations of antiquity (e. g., p. 320). He concentrates his interest so strongly on this period of Syrian conquests and its (I believe, cheap and fruitless) laurels that he treats the period after 1200 B. C. rather slightly and breaks off with the Persian conquest. This is not just. That later period, to mention only one side of it, offers so many points of contact with the history of other nations that it may seem to very many people the most interesting epoch. However, it would rob the book of its most attractive features, if its warm enthusiasm should be reduced everywhere to meagre, cool, cautious statements accompanied by the

heavy apparatus of the historian. The real purpose of the work, to interest wider circles in the land of sphinxes and pyramids, has certainly been maintained with great literary ability. I hope it will spread much interest in the ancient East.

Only the treatment of the transliteration of Egyptian names, abounding in unwarranted innovations and inconsistencies, is hardly suited to a popular work. True, the transliteration question is the weakest spot of Egyptology, and there is little hope that the general uncertainty and confusion will soon be removed. How necessary a general reform is may be seen from Breasted's mistaking the *t* (*i. e.*, *ts*) of a certain system of transcription for the Semitic *t*, *i. e.*, English *th* (*cf.* "Ereth", p. 483, etc.).

W. MAX MÜLLER.

The Religion of the Ancient Egyptians. By GEORGE STEINDORFF, Ph.D., Professor of Egyptology at the University of Leipzig. [American Lectures on the History of Religions, Fifth Series, 1903–1904.] (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1905. Pp. xi, 178.)

THIS brief sketch of Egyptian religion, in five lectures, betrays ability to present dry and difficult subjects in a popular way. It is readable and clear, and avoids unessential details as well as unsafe and unintelligible transcriptions. Some faulty transcriptions are retained on account of their venerable age, for example, the old "Piankhi" (p. 84) or conventional forms like "Maat" (p. 92; but late Egyptian *mēi* suggests different vowels). Why not use for the unwarranted transcription "Twet" (nether-world, p. 126) the late Egyptian pronunciation *Tēi*?

The booklet follows the general outlines, style, and largely also the views of Adolf Erman's chapter on Egyptian religion in his *Life in Ancient Egypt* (1894). The chapter on religion proper is extremely brief compared with others on by-paths of religion, such as the burial customs. The chapter on temples and ceremonies is proportionately very full, and includes some new matter.

A criticism of Steindorff's views on Egyptian religion proper is not easy for one who does not share those views in several essential respects. Steindorff reproduces the opinions of a school of which Maspero was the ablest exponent, opinions which have been dominant for some twenty years and are still held by many. The nucleus of our most important difference of opinion may be found on p. 5: "a religion which, like the whole of Egyptian culture, followed its own development in entire independence of all foreign influence". This greatly overstates the independence of Egyptian culture. We know that Egypt, at all periods, was in close communication with all centres of civilization, at least, of south-eastern Europe and western Asia, and that nothing was more strongly subjected to constant foreign influences than its religion. Hence it is impossible to understand the riches of Egyptian mythology from any other standpoint than the comparative one. This point of view is totally